

# The Sun.

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1895.

Subscription by Mail Post-Paid.  
 DAILY, Per Month, \$1.00  
 DAILY, Per Year, \$10.00  
 SUNDAY, Per Year, \$3.00  
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$12.00  
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.00  
 WEEKLY, Per Year, \$3.00  
 Postage to Foreign Countries added.  
 THE SUN, New York City.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Local News. The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and New York Associated Press is at 41 to 43 Nassau street. All information and documents for public use are promptly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

## War Ships for Cuban Waters.

It is evident that the Spanish Government, whose arrogance and brutality provoke its Cuban subjects to rebellion, requires a sharp and stinging lesson at the hands of the United States. An American merchant steamer, the *Alliandra*, pursuing a lawful voyage from Colon to New York, has been chased and repeatedly fired at by a Spanish gunboat. No right of search can be pretended by Spain, for she does not acknowledge the existence of an insurrection in Cuba. The Spanish gunboat, therefore, has committed a flagrant violation of international law. The American flag has been insulted, and the lives and property of American citizens have been placed in jeopardy.

How will our Government vindicate the honor of our flag and the rights of our fellow citizens? Undoubtedly, it will at once exact full reparation and a humble apology for the monstrous outrage perpetrated on an American vessel peacefully navigating the high seas. But the procurement of full redress for the wrong already done will not by any means exhaust the duty of our Government. It is bound without a moment's loss of time to take adequate precautions against the repetition of such injuries, and to assure absolute safety to our merchant navy throughout the Caribbean, and the waters adjacent. All our available war ships should be concentrated where the treatment of the *Alliandra* shows them to be imperatively needed. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The naval force which we are able to dispatch to Cuban waters will prove entirely competent to protect Americans from Spanish insolence and aggression. Of the North Atlantic squadron under the command of Admiral MEADE, six ships, namely, the *New York*, the *Cincinnati*, the *Minneapolis*, the *Atlanta*, the *Raleigh*, and the *Montgomery*, are already near the scene of trouble, and these can be speedily reinforced by the *Columbia*, the *Miantonomoh*, the *Amphitrite*, the *Terror*, the *Puritan*, and the *Maine*. These vessels constitute an array more than qualified to deal with any war fleet which could be now put in commission by bankrupt Spain; even if history did not show that one English or American ship can be depended on to beat two Spanish ships of equal size. In a word, if to an abject apology for their wanton attack upon our merchant steamer, the Spaniards should prefer recourse to war, they can unquestionably get their fill of it.

We take for granted that the measures needed for the protection of American merchant ships in Cuban waters will be taken instantly, and not deferred until the Madrid circumlocution office has been brought to the point of offering appropriate amends for the insult to our national ensign. We may also assume, we hope, that plain and peremptory orders will be given to our naval officers with the intent that the next shot fired by a Spanish war ship on a vessel flying the Stars and Stripes, shall be followed by a broadside from an American cruiser. The rule in such a case should be to strike first and explain afterward. The next Spanish gunboat that molests an American merchant vessel ought to be pursued and blown out of the water.

Many grievous blunders have been laid to the charge of our State Department in connection with Hawaii, with Samoa, and with the quarrel between China and Japan. It now has a chance to redeem itself, at least in some degree. Let it take with regard to the *Alliandra* outrage the indignant and unflinching attitude which the rights of our citizens and the honor of our flag demand: Let it bring Spain to her knees, or punish her by the destruction of her navy and the loss of Cuba! Then and then might the CLEVELAND Administration regain a part of the esteem which seemed but yesterday irretrievably lost.

## The Eleven New War Vessels.

In the number of new war vessels contributed to the navy, the last session of Congress surpassed any other since the end of the civil war. The act of March 3, 1883, which laid the foundation of the steel fleet, under Secretary CHANDLER, provided for three cruisers and a dispatch vessel. The act of March 3, 1885, also under Mr. CHANDLER, added two more cruisers and two gunboats. The act of Aug. 8, 1886, under Secretary WHITNEY, authorized two armored ships, two cruisers, and a torpedo boat. The act of March 3, 1887, yielded a coast defender, two cruisers, and two gunboats; while an armored cruiser, six protected cruisers, and a practice ship, eight vessels in all, were added the following year. The act of June 30, 1890, under Secretary TRACY, was unprecedentedly liberal, with its three great battle ships, a very large protected cruiser, and a torpedo boat. Several other sessions have furnished more moderate additions.

But never until now has a single bill contributed eleven vessels to the new steel fleet. Besides, as, in the present act, that number includes two 10,000-ton battle ships, six 1,000-ton gunboats, and three torpedo boats, while the aggregate tonnage provided and expense contemplated are unequalled in any preceding act except the one of 1890.

It is further indicated by the plans on which the designers and draughtsmen of

the Navy Department have already been busy, that these three classes of vessels authorized will surpass in effectiveness all others of the same general types hitherto undertaken here. The two battle ships will, perhaps, be larger than any now afloat. The contract price of the Iowa, 11,410 tons, was \$3,010,000 for hull and machinery. The new act allows \$4,000,000 as the maximum on each battle ship; and, while it is not at all probable that the maximum will be used, an approach to 12,000 tons may be made in the displacement. The act calls for ships of "about 10,000 tons," but the act of 1890 called for ships of "about 8,000 tons," and the Indiana class, of 10,288, were actually built under it. So the Iowa, of 11,410 tons, was constructed on an authorization of about 9,000, and the Brooklyn, of 9,371, on an authorization of about 8,000. There has never been any complaint at getting a larger vessel for a less price than was contemplated.

The horse power called for in the Indiana class is 9,000 and in the Iowa 11,000, but in the two new battle ships it is likely to be 12,000; and the speed expected will probably be about 17½ knots, whereas only 15 are exacted and 16 or more expected in the Indiana class, and 16 exacted with perhaps 17 expected in the Iowa. The coal-carrying capacity will be larger also than in the Indiana class, so giving them a greater steaming radius, which is desirable even in coast-line battle ships.

But it is in armor and armament that novelties or advances are likely to be most marked. The Indiana class have 18 inches of armor on the sides, 17 inches on the largest turrets, and 15 inches on the largest gun turrets. They were planned before the Harvey process had been adopted, which gives an equal resisting power with less thickness of armor. Hence, when the Iowa was laid down the barbettes and turret armor was reduced to 15 inches and the side armor to 14, and that in turn allowed a greater length of armor on the sides, the water line belt being made more than one-fourth longer in that vessel. We may expect to see the same policy carried out and even pushed further; for, with a maximum thickness of 15 inches will be found possible to extend the armored belt so as, if necessary, to carry it, at least to a certain thickness, all around the ship. The modern tendency seems to favor giving more protection to the ends of battle ships.

As to the battery, each ship will undoubtedly carry four 13-inch rifles, like the Indiana class. For, although the Iowa's largest guns are four 12-inch, and this is also the maximum calibre in the newest British vessels, yet the successful resistance offered the other day by the CARNegie 18-inch plate for the Oregon to a 12-inch gun suggests the value of the 13-inch. The Indiana carries also eight 8-inch guns and four 6-inch, and the Iowa eight 8-inch and six 4-inch; but an Ordnance Bureau officer has developed for the two new battle ships the novel idea of placing the turrets for the 13-inch guns, and in that case their range of fire would allow a reduction in the number of this calibre if desired. But in this matter as in others the final word is not yet said.

In the six new gunboats the main novelty will, of course, be their composite construction and sheathing, which will enable them to go longer without docking. Indeed, at least one, if not all, of the three gunboats now building at Newport News would undoubtedly have been composite but for the neglect to remove the usual restriction that all our new vessels shall be built of steel. This oversight was repaired in the present act. The authorized displacement of about 1,000 tons will be somewhat increased, perhaps to near 1,200, which will make the boats more useful. The main batteries of the Newport News vessels consist of eight 4-inch guns, and the exacted speed of the fastest is fourteen knots. The new vessels will probably carry eight 5-inch guns and also be considerably faster.

As to the three torpedo boats, they are likely to resemble closely the three for which the awards have not yet been made; but possibly they may improve on them a little, as the limit of cost is somewhat larger. Such are the eleven new vessels just authorized. The experience acquired by American builders in the last ten years should accelerate their completion, and, so far as present plans indicate, they will carry still higher the American standard of efficiency.

## The Non-Partisan Imposture.

Since Col. STRONG became Mayor by 153,000 votes against 109,000, the urgency and methods of the Mugwump and Civil Service Reformers have been edifying. During some twenty years last past they have preached incessantly against the wickedness of the "spoils system," as exemplified in indiscriminate removals from office, using as their text a casual remark made in the Senate by Mr. MARCY when a member of that body. They have denounced as the sum of all villainy the idea that in our politics, "as to the victors belong the spoils."

And yet what have we seen since those Mugwumps and Reformers came to power in this city under Col. STRONG? Such a carnival of spoils was never before witnessed. The newspaper organs of the Reformers are replete daily with news, gossip, crimination, and recrimination in regard to removals from office, and the pressing need of hastening such removals. Not content with the existing laws restraining the use of the "spoils system," under which laws the Democrats carried on the State and city business, the Reformers began by denouncing new legislation to enable Mayor STRONG to summarily dismiss long-tried and faithful officers without trial, or satisfactory evidence of fault, and anew cement together his followers by the "cohesive power of public plunder." The Republican Legislature at Albany has given to the Mayor, without debate, a power of wholesale removals, which the Governor hastened to approve. Nothing like it was ever before known in the history of New York.

The Reformers plead as their excuse that the Democratic city Government had been bad, the Democratic city and State officials corrupt and inefficient; but precisely that excuse Whigs and Republicans made against Democrats and Jackson and the Albany Regency made against Whigs, in former days. The Civil Service Reformers formerly denounced that excuse as untrue, intolerable, and devilish; but now, being in power, they have changed their tune.

The PARKHURST-STRONG Committee of Seventy Reformers, despite their parade and pretence of investigation by skilled and honest accountants during two months, have not yet reported the misappropriation of a penny of city money by Democratic or Tammany officials, or any incompetency on their part; yet the spoils system is nevertheless worked all the same.

The police force has been proved to have been saturated with venality, but Tammany did not have absolute control over the police. The Democrats, in full power elsewhere in the city, were impotent as to

police discipline, because hampered by the presence of two Republican Commissioners. The time of the new Republican Government at Albany has, for two months, been largely devoted to the "spoils." The Governor, the Lieutenant-Governor, and the Speaker of the Assembly seem to have done or thought of little else than to contrive new legislation to empty offices of Democratic incumbents. The Committee of Seventy demanded that the legislative power at Albany should be used, first of all and solely to enable them to make a clean sweep of the Democratic city officials. The three highest officers of the State, Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, and Speaker, go back and forth over the Hudson River, in seemingly abject subservience to the "spoils system." Such obsequious, cringing, servile prostitution of the legislative power of the Empire State to mere "patronage," has rarely if ever before been seen. If the illustrious MARCY were alive, it would make him open his eyes in bewildering amazement.

Beside such conduct on the part of high officers of the State, the doings of that distinguished private citizen, Mr. PLATT, have been almost praiseworthy and patriotic. He created them all, MONTGOMERY, SEXTON, FISH, and STRONG; but he could never have anticipated they would thus behave themselves in office. Nowhere, literally nowhere, either in the Capitol in Albany or in the City Hall in New York, during these two months and a half of reform, has there been either an Executive recommendation, or, apparently, an hour of serious consultation, or, at least, a manner of deliberation which the "spoils" could not elude.

The "Destruction of the Tammany gang" would be a good political cry, but before the removal of an official, he should be tried according to civil service theories, be proved and shown to be corrupt or incompetent. Otherwise his removal is only an application of the "spoils system." The platform of the Committee of Seventy began thus:

"Municipal government should be entirely divorced from party politics, and from selfish personal ambition or gain."

"Entirely divorced" was the pledge! Then followed a promise that the "public service of this city should be conducted on a strictly non-partisan basis." Col. STRONG, in his letter accepting the Committee's nomination, gave the platform his entire approval, and promised if elected to administer the city's affairs in a manner "entirely non-partisan," and to "make all appointments without regard to party lines."

Here was an explicit assurance, an engagement confirmed with swearing by bell, book, and candle, that there should be no discrimination for mere party reasons against the hundred thousand Democrats who voted for GRANT!

Now Mugwumps and Civil Service Reformers! Have you no sense of shame? You solicited Democratic votes, and received them, on your pledge distinctly and repeatedly made, that if the Committee of Seventy candidates were elected, you would, first of all, carefully, and without partisan purpose, inquire into each department of the city service, and then remove from office only the corrupt, or the inefficient, or the unnecessary. Instead of that, you began wholesale removals before you had even inspection. You promised the voters that in selecting new officials you would neither inquire into, nor remove, any one's party affiliation, but instead of that you have thus far carefully excluded all of the 109,000 who voted for GRANT. You have confined the new appointments to the 105,000 Republicans and 50,000 Mugwumps and deluded, or rattling, Democrats who voted for STRONG. More than that: you have enlarged the precept which gave the spoils to the victors, by raiding, plundering, your own camp, in the form of picking and choosing, not by the sole test of competency, but by the test of PLATT vs. Anti-PLATT! Instead of endeavoring to make, as you said you would, a government for all and by all, a government wherein every thought of building up a party machine, and holding power by patronage, should be excluded, you have begun, with your effort for universal removal, a system of Democratic favoritism in public office, such as New York never beheld before.

A Bill to Re-establish Divides.

The "divides" of New York, pernicious resorts enjoying an immunity from excise license, have always been sustained by the patronage of countrymen from the interior, and it is entirely appropriate, therefore, that a bill to revive the "divides," and to abate all restrictions against them, should have its origin in Madison or Ontario county.

During the civil war, and for some years after its close, a gross evil was introduced into this city by the establishment of saloons on the chief thoroughfares, at which women or girls acted as waitresses. These resorts became meeting places for the depraved, and a menace to the moral health of the community; and ultimately they had to be suppressed by the passage of a stringent law making it a misdemeanor for a licensed saloon keeper to permit the attendance of any woman or girl not of his family.

After the breaking up of these "divides," effected by public sentiment, another form of "divide" came into existence: concert saloons admitting all comers free without restrictions. These saloons were on the chief avenues of travel, and though, ostensibly, places for refreshment, they were usually the meeting places of thieves and other disreputable characters. The names of some of these saloons, which were sufficiently descriptive them: "The Star and Garter," "The Black and Tan," "The Sans Souci," "The Buckingham," "The Crown," "The Empire," "The Haymarket," "The Dew Drop Inn," "The Four Seasons," "The Alhambra" and "The Armory." Against the abuses of "divides" maintained under false pretences, the Legislature applied the summary remedy of putting the matter of license in the hands of the Mayor, and thus, little by little, with the aid of the police, the "divides" were broken up, and beer and whiskey selling in this town was kept distinct from concerts, to the extent that the law could keep it so.

The KERN law now pending in Albany, and in support of which many rural Republicans appear to be united, is a bill to undo the good work heretofore performed of ridding New York of "divides." It provides for their reestablishment. By paying \$500, of which \$250 goes outside of New York city, any man can establish a saloon in New York, without limitation or restriction. He can take the first floor of a private house, the top floor of a flat, a house near a church or school, a club room, a theatre, a ferry house, a police station, a court house, or a store. So long as he pays the \$500 no questions are asked; there is no one to ask them; his receipt is his authorization. Under this law, if adopted, there would be nothing to prevent a brisk opening up of

"divides" all over town. The profits of the business are large; a \$500 license is no deterrent. It is, indeed, only a protection against excessive competition.

At the present time the Board of Excise can withhold licenses from "divides," and Boards of Excise do withhold them. When they do this there is no way of securing licenses. Under the KERN law there will be no way of preventing them. This is one of the most reprehensible features of the proposed new law, dangerous alike to moral health, public order, and respect for law.

Five hundred "divides," paying \$500 each for license, would interfere with the sale of \$250,000 in license, which the Comptroller's office in Albany would receive \$125,000 for the benefit of rural counties. New York city would receive \$125,000, but the extra police expenses, court expenses, and prison expenses which the authorized opening of "divides" would entail, would offset this to a great extent, irrespective of other mischief produced.

## A Wonderful Transformation.

HAS RICHARD OLNEY of Massachusetts, the able and successful corporation lawyer, turned Socialist?

It looks so from his speech to the Supreme Court concerning the income tax. "When this Income Tax law," said OLNEY, "makes a special class of business corporations and taxes their incomes at a higher rate than that applied to the incomes of persons not incorporated, it recognizes existing social facts and conditions which it would be folly to ignore."

But corporations are only associations of individuals. Mr. OLNEY, as a noted and experienced corporation lawyer, must know how large a share of the stock in enterprises of this "special class" is owned by persons of moderate means, small holders who have been thrifty and have saved something for investment. If he doesn't know, let him apply to the Secretary of the Western Union Telegraph Company, or to the Secretary of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company.

It is common knowledge," remarks this ingenious and prosperous attorney for corporations, "that corporations are so successful an agency for the conduct of business and the accumulation of wealth, that a large section of the community views them with intense disfavor as maliciously and cunningly devised inventions for making rich people richer, and poor people poorer."

Has Mr. OLNEY, we ask, turned Socialist? And how about Mr. JAMES C. CARTER of New York, the able and prosperous attorney for so many of these maliciously and cunningly devised concerns for making rich people richer and poor people poorer? Has he turned Populist agitator, too?

In his speech on Tuesday, he threatened the country with a Socialist uprising and a violent and perhaps bloody revolution in case the Supreme Court should attempt to enforce constitutional restrictions on the power of Congress to legislate as it pleases. If that is not what Mr. CARTER's words mean, what do they mean?

If in the very hour of his triumph," said Mr. CARTER, "I refer to the promoters of the Populist income tax for the repression of wealth," they find an obstacle in their way in the shape of a judgment in a lawsuit, they are liable, if need be, to find a way to accomplish their ends over the Constitution and the Courts."

Has THE SUN or any other newspaper recorded in years past anything more astonishing, we may even say more stupefying, than these utterances? Whence comes the seed, the germ, the virus which has reached the minds of these distinguished, and, from the worldly point of view, prosperous corporation lawyers? Have they been reading the published writings and speeches of GROVER CLEVELAND?

The Chamber of Commerce rooms should to-day contain one of the most distinguished companies of lawyers, assembled at the invitation of the New York Kindergarten Association, to hear argument for the addition of the kindergarten to the curriculum of the public schools. We advise the financial and commercial magnates of the city to go and hear that can be said in favor of this proposition, at 3 P. M.

Japan's grasp of the essential, practical results of our nineteenth century civilization, to Western eyes at least, the most startling feature of the war now waging in the East. The innovation which the Japanese Government is reported to introduce in its rewards for military valor, would do honor to any hard-headed Yankee or British business man. Instead of a bit of ribbon with a medal or a cross attached to it, to be worn on state occasions, the hero of the war will receive a watch that he can use without ostentation, every day of his life, and on whose case will be inscribed the service which he has rendered to his country.

The presentation of a watch as a reward for gallant deeds, or because of personal esteem, is not unknown among us, but Japan has got the start of us in this general application of the *utile cum honoris*, and once more shows her amazingly progressive sense.

In the election of that all-around Episcopal clergyman, the Rev. Dr. RAINFORD, to the Presidency of the New York Cricket Association, we discern a sign of the times. Dr. Rainford, who throughout that State are for McKinley, they admire him, they are for McKinley, and they would like to see him nominated for the Presidency.

Mr. Platt and some of the other politicians who by means of a well-organized machine, have controlled the Republican party in Conventions, and have manipulated delegations as they saw fit, will not be able to dispose of the people. Mr. Platt has wished to be elected to the office of Governor. It now seems that Mayor Strong and his friends may name a majority of the delegates. In that case, the people of New York's great vote in the National Convention is likely to come in for a good deal. There are now seven clubs in the New York Cricket Association, and there will probably be twice as many before the close of his Presidency. In regard to the question of the championship matches settlement will not be delayed. He will not need his club, which he has bought for \$10,000, to play the regular services of St. George's Cricket Club.

In England many of the clergymen of the Established Church are famous cricketers, and a curate may be helped to a bishopric there by his expertness at the game. It is possible that the President of the New York Cricket Association may yet be exalted to the Episcopate.

It is a preposterous resolution which has been introduced into the Illinois Legislature for the suppression of the big department stores that have been established in Chicago and other cities of the State. Under the Constitution of Illinois, the Legislature does not possess the power to suppress a business, but the constitution of mercantile business in our times it is wholly powerless against them.

We suppose it is true that "we depreciate the value of real estate" in some localities, but they increase its value in other localities. If they are disadvantageous to some traders, they are beneficial to others. If they cheapen goods, the buyer will not complain, and if they draw custom from the small retail stores, that is the affair of the customers. The Legislature of a State cannot compel people to purchase their supplies from small dealers. No explanation is given of the statement in the resolution before the Illinois Legislature that big department stores are "injurious to public morality." We do not see how customers can be demoralized by those of them that deal honestly, if the clerks are polite.

There are people here as well as in Illinois who desire legislation oppressive to the department houses. They cannot obtain it, and it cannot be enacted in this State or any other. They might

as well seek the suppression of all those other great combinations for production, transportation, and exchange which have already become a part of the world of business. The irresistible tendency of our times is toward business concentration and economy, and toward the reduction of manual labor. Forces have been set afoot which legislation has no control, and all of us must try to arrange our affairs that they will insure to our benefit.

The Board of Health has sent to the editor of our esteemed contemporary, the *Herald*, a very handsome letter acknowledging the material assistance rendered by that journal in the production of diphtheria anti-toxine. Through this assistance the Board is now prepared to furnish anti-toxine on demand to the entire city of New York.

This acknowledgment of the Board of Health forms a well-deserved tribute to a charitable impulse as disinterested as it was benevolent.

The destruction of NIKOLA TESLA's workshop, with its wonderful contents, is something more than a private calamity. It is a catastrophe to the whole world. It is not in any degree an exaggeration to say that the men living at this time who are more important to the human race than this young gentleman, can be counted on the fingers of one hand; perhaps on the thumb of one hand.

In Chicago the taxgatherer's hand has been laid on the bicycle, two dollars a year having been demanded from every wheel. This illustrates the objectionable policy of taxing everything which popular use makes noticeable. Why should bicycles be taxed rather than hats or shoes?

The Congress of the republic of Guatemala has liberalized its laws for the encouragement of immigration from the United States and Europe. It is a country of abounding resources, and its rich soil is especially adapted to the growth of coffee, sugar, grain, and tropical fruits. Its population is sparse, and needs two or three times the number of inhabitants it has ever had. There are extensive regions of which it is healthy, and in which the climate is agreeable.

The worst thing about the republic is its belatedness. The people there fight each other in civil war and fight other republics, Mexico excepted; they are unstable, often in political turmoil, and subject to the rule of dictators. If Guatemala wants immigrants, she must enlarge the public freedom, maintain the peace, and refrain from quarrelling with Mexico.

We are pleased to see that the patriotic example of New York in raising the American flag above the schools, and in decorating the main schoolroom with the picture of WASHINGTON, has had an influence in many other places throughout the Union, and has been widely followed. All American boys and girls should be taught to love their country and its heroes, and to be grateful to the great founders of our free Government.

Question: Why did Congress adjourn without enacting some law for the restriction of immigration? Answer: Congress failed in many other duties. It is fortunate that immigration, in a large measure, self-regulative. The people of the country demand that laborers in this country; it decreases when the demand is lessened. It was very great up to 1893; it has fallen off enormously within the past two years. It rises with the advance of prosperity, and falls at the approach of adversity. It has been years when the immigration was as great as it is now, and in the port of New York we received only 167,000 immigrants last year, while in 1892 we received 375,000. Besides, many thousands of the immigrants who had come to this country before last year left it then on account of the lack of employment, and they have carried back with them the people of the country, and the effect of moderating the immigration for many years to come. It is not an especial cause of regret that, under existing circumstances, Congress failed to enact any law on the subject of immigration.

The revelations respecting firebrags at Mount Vernon, N. Y., are shocking. The gang there is a branch of the New York city gang, which evidently has branches in many places. There is a secret society of firebrags, organized for the reckless and human life, scheming to make money out of the insurance companies. It hires both plotters and desperadoes, and it has travelling agents. There is reason to believe that the chief of the society has been the Russian who was sent to jail the other day; but the arrests at Mount Vernon and elsewhere give proof that the people of the city are yet at large.

A Russian," who recently sent a letter to THE SUN protesting that the new kind of firebrags were not to be spoken of as Russians. It is nevertheless a fact that nearly all of them who have been arrested in various places were men and women who came here from Russia. Could they be Jewish?

## WILL STRONG BREAK DOWN PLATT?

The Ohio Issue in New York Politics.

From the Cincinnati Tribune.

The rise and fall of William L. Strong in New York city has been a national political topic. Strong is an enthusiastic friend of McKinley and one of long standing. They have much in common. The Mayor of New York is an ardent supporter of the principle of protection, and he believes in William McKinley as the most and ablest exponent. He is likely to be in a position next year to be of inestimable service to the country.

If he succeeds in breaking down the Platt machine, and there is every reason to believe that he will, he and his friends will be able to control all, or a considerable portion, of the New York delegation in the next Republican National Convention. This means that McKinley will have fair treatment. It means that the wishes of the great masses of the Republican party of New York State will have expression in the platform of the party. It means that the people of New York will have a voice in the selection of their representatives to the National Convention. It means that the people of New York will have a voice in the selection of their representatives to the National Convention.

Mr. Platt and some of the other politicians who by means of a well-organized machine, have controlled the Republican party in Conventions, and have manipulated delegations as they saw fit, will not be able to dispose of the people. Mr. Platt has wished to be elected to the office of Governor. It now seems that Mayor Strong and his friends may name a majority of the delegates. In that case, the people of New York's great vote in the National Convention is likely to come in for a good deal. There are now seven clubs in the New York Cricket Association, and there will probably be twice as many before the close of his Presidency. In regard to the question of the championship matches settlement will not be delayed. He will not need his club, which he has bought for \$10,000, to play the regular services of St. George's Cricket Club.

In England many of the clergymen of the Established Church are famous cricketers, and a curate may be helped to a bishopric there by his expertness at the game. It is possible that the President of the New York Cricket Association may yet be exalted to the Episcopate.

It is a preposterous resolution which has been introduced into the Illinois Legislature for the suppression of the big department stores that have been established in Chicago and other cities of the State. Under the Constitution of Illinois, the Legislature does not possess the power to suppress a business, but the constitution of mercantile business in our times it is wholly powerless against them.

We suppose it is true that "we depreciate the value of real estate" in some localities, but they increase its value in other localities. If they are disadvantageous to some traders, they are beneficial to others. If they cheapen goods, the buyer will not complain, and if they draw custom from the small retail stores, that is the affair of the customers. The Legislature of a State cannot compel people to purchase their supplies from small dealers. No explanation is given of the statement in the resolution before the Illinois Legislature that big department stores are "injurious to public morality." We do not see how customers can be demoralized by those of them that deal honestly, if the clerks are polite.

There are people here as well as in Illinois who desire legislation oppressive to the department houses. They cannot obtain it, and it cannot be enacted in this State or any other. They might

as well seek the suppression of all those other great combinations for production, transportation, and exchange which have already become a part of the world of business. The irresistible tendency of our times is toward business concentration and economy, and toward the reduction of manual labor. Forces have been set afoot which legislation has no control, and all of us must try to arrange our affairs that they will insure to our benefit.

## A GREAT PRINCIPLE INVOLVED.

Practically an attempt to kidnap a Citizen of New York, Teacher Formed an Error.

From the Philadelphia Record of Yesterday.

Mr. Dana is a citizen and resident of New York, and the matter complained of as a libel was published in THE NEW YORK SUN. The ground for the removal of Mr. Dana to Washington is that copies of the paper containing the alleged libel were circulated in Washington, and the circulation constituting publication in the District of Columbia, he is liable to criminal prosecution there.

The principle involved, it will clearly be seen, is one of much greater importance than the truth or falsity of the charge.

The evils that may result therefrom and the oppression that the citizen might be subjected to if such action should be declared to be legal, are manifest and will suggest themselves at once to the reader. But that there is likely to be any such result following this attempt, practically, to kidnap a New York citizen under the forms of law, is scarcely to be apprehended.

What may be the law of the District of Columbia in relation to the status of the papers of the courts of the District surely have no wider jurisdiction than the courts of the United States, and in a matter of this kind the United States courts have no jurisdiction, no matter where the parties to the controversy reside.

It is true that the United States tribunals have jurisdiction in cases arising between citizens of different States, but that question of residence can only give jurisdiction to those courts in civil cases. A criminal prosecution is not regarded as an action between individuals, but as proceeding by a State against one who has violated her laws. Such prosecutions are for the purpose of punishing wrongs committed against the public, and not for the purpose of punishing wrongs as between individuals, but as proceeding by a State against one who has violated her laws. Such prosecutions are for the purpose of punishing wrongs committed against the public, and not for the purpose of punishing wrongs as between individuals, but as proceeding by a State against one who has violated her laws.

There is no law upon the statute books of the United States punishing a libel upon one citizen by another, and the authority for Congress to punish a libel is not easily to be found within the Federal Constitution. Article I, section 8, paragraph 8, defines the powers of Congress: "Congress shall have power 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, and in any department or office thereof.' That restriction of the powers of Congress clearly excludes from it the authority to enact a law punishing one citizen for libelling another citizen; such an offense comes within the powers of the State and is not referred to the United States.

There is no law upon the statute books of the United States punishing a libel upon one citizen by another, and the authority for Congress to punish a libel is not easily to be found within the Federal Constitution. Article I, section 8, paragraph 8, defines the powers of Congress: "Congress shall have power 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, and in any department or office thereof.' That restriction of the powers of Congress clearly excludes from it the authority to enact a law punishing one citizen for libelling another citizen; such an offense comes within the powers of the State and is not referred to the United States.

The Constitution provides another obstacle to the taking of Mr. Dana to Washington for trial in the District courts. There is no power in any State to drag an accused person from another State for trial in its courts, and that person is a fugitive from justice. And Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, can give no more authority to the District courts than the State courts possess. Congress could, of course, provide punishment for criminal libel in the District courts, but before that it must first be made a crime by the laws of that State. In no sense can Mr. Dana be considered a fugitive from justice from the District of Columbia.

The Constitution provides another obstacle to the taking of Mr. Dana to Washington for trial in the District courts. There is no power in any State to drag an accused person from another State for trial in its courts, and that person is a fugitive from justice. And Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, can give no more authority to the District courts than the State courts possess. Congress could, of course, provide punishment for criminal libel in the District courts, but before that it must first be made a crime by the laws of that State. In no sense can Mr. Dana be considered a fugitive from justice from the District of Columbia.

The clear intent and purpose of that provision is that the accused shall be tried by a jury of his fellow citizens of the State, and not taken from his domicile into a foreign jurisdiction to be tried by a jury of strangers. The requirement of the Constitution is binding upon the Federal Government, and it cannot be that, simply under the authority of legislating for the government of the affairs of the District of Columbia, the Congress has the power to create tribunals of wider and more extended powers than the courts of the States, and to take cases created under the fundamental law of the Union.